

**SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF****ANTHONY M. SANDONATO****ON BEHALF OF****THE SOUTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF REGULATORY STAFF****DOCKET NO. 2019-224-E****DOCKET NO. 2019-225-E****IN RE: SOUTH CAROLINA ENERGY FREEDOM ACT (HOUSE BILL 3659)****PROCEEDING RELATED TO S.C. CODE ANN. SECTION 58-37-40 AND****INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANS FOR DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC****AND DUKE ENERGY PROGRESS, LLC****Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION.**

**A.** My name is Anthony Sandonato. My business address is 1401 Main Street, Suite 900, Columbia, South Carolina, 29201. I am employed by the South Carolina Office of Regulatory Staff ("ORS") in the Energy Operations Division as a Senior Regulatory Manager.

**Q. DID YOU FILE DIRECT TESTIMONY AND TWO EXHIBITS RELATED TO THIS PROCEEDING?**

**A.** Yes. I filed Direct Testimony and two (2) exhibits with the Public Service Commission of South Carolina ("Commission") on February 5, 2021. I also filed Revised Direct Testimony and two (2) exhibits with the Commission on March 4, 2021.

**Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

**A.** The purpose of my Surrebuttal Testimony is to set forth and support ORS's recommendations resulting from the examination and review of Duke Energy Carolinas,

1 LLC's ("DEC") Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP") and Duke Energy Progress, LLC's  
2 ("DEP") IRP, (Collectively "Duke Energy" or the "Companies"), associated filings in the  
3 dockets to determine compliance with certain sections of the South Carolina Energy  
4 Freedom Act ("Act 62" or the "Act").

5 **Q. DO THE COMPANIES' IRPS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PROVIDED**  
6 **IN REBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS COMPLY WITH S.C. CODE ANN.**  
7 **§ 58-37-40(B)(1)?**

8 **A.** Yes. As discussed in my Revised Direct Testimony, the Companies' IRPs as filed  
9 with the Commission include the elements required under S.C. Code Ann. §58-37-  
10 40(B)(1). Additionally, Duke Energy's witnesses provided additional detail and responses  
11 to all of ORS's recommendations for the Companies' 2020 IRPs and responded to all  
12 information that was requested to be included or addressed in future IRPs.

13 **Q. DID EACH COMPANY PROVIDE RESPONSES SUCH THAT IT'S IRP MEETS**  
14 **ALL OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS IDENTIFIED IN YOUR REVISED**  
15 **DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

16 **A.** No. The Companies disagreed with two recommendations included in my Revised  
17 Direct Testimony and outlined in the ORS Reports. Specifically, Recommendation 18 and  
18 23. ORS witness Hayet and Kollen discuss these items in greater detail in their Surrebuttal  
19 Testimonies.

20 **Q. DID ORS'S REVIEW OF THE COMPANIES' REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**  
21 **IDENTIFY ADDITIONAL FLAWS THAT REQUIRE CORRECTION IN THIS**  
22 **PROCEEDING?**

1     **A.**             No. However, ORS witnesses Kollen, Hayet and Barron discuss in their Surrebuttal  
2             Testimonies recommendations that could improve future IRP proceedings.

3     **Q.     PLEASE SUMMARIZE ORS'S RECOMMENDATION RELATED TO THE**  
4             **COMPANIES' IRP AND INFORMATION PROVIDED IN REBUTTAL**  
5             **TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS.**

6     **A.**             ORS recommends each Company continue to work with stakeholders through its  
7             planning process as well as incorporate all changes that were addressed in the IRP  
8             Proceedings. Based on the information filed by the Companies, ORS offers no additional  
9             recommendations for the Commission through its Surrebuttal Testimonies.

10    **Q.     WILL YOU UPDATE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY BASED ON**  
11            **INFORMATION THAT BECOMES AVAILABLE?**

12    **A.**             Yes. ORS fully reserves the right to revise its recommendations via supplemental  
13             testimony should new information not previously provided by the Companies, or other  
14             sources, becomes available.

15    **Q.     DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

16    **A.**             Yes, it does.